



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/393,563

Applicant(s)

WOODWARD ET AL

Examiner

Matthew J. Gerike

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 10 September 1999 is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

### Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Drawings***

Figure 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-14 & 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stoffels et al. (U.S. 5,751,111).

Stoffels discloses a ceramic metal halide lamp (figure 1) comprising: an envelope (outer envelope 1); an elongated interior chamber (discharge vessel 3) disposed within the envelope having a lamp body (discharge vessel 3) located therein; at least one electrode lead (halide resistant portion 51, 41 and electrode rod 4a, 5a) partially housed by the interior chamber; and a single continuous elongated mandrel (halide resistant portion 41, 51) forming a shaft of the electrode lead as recited in claim 1.

Wherein the interior chamber has first and second legs (ceramic closing plugs 34, 35) extending therefrom for receiving a first and second lead (portions 40 & 50), respectively as recited in claim 2.

Wherein the electrode lead includes an electrode tip coil (tips 4b, 5b; winding 4c, 5c) operatively associated with one end of the end of the mandrel (halide resistance portion 41, 51) as recited in claim 3.

Wherein the electrode tip coil is formed from tungsten (W, see column 4, lines10-12) as recited in claim 4.

Wherein the electrode lead includes an overwind component (Mo coil, 41a, 51a) operatively associated with the mandrel at a predetermined position as recited in claim 5.

Wherein the overwind component is formed from molybdenum (Mo coil, 41a, 51a) as recited in claim 6.

Wherein the electrode lead includes an electrode tip coil (tips 4b, 5b; winding 4c, 5c) disposed at one end of the mandrel and an overwind component (Mo coil, 41a & 51a) received over the other end of the mandrel, the outside diameter of the overwind component being greater than the outside diameter of the electrode tip coil (see figure 2) as recited in claim 8.

Stoffels discloses a ceramic metal halide lamp (figure 1) comprising: an envelope (envelope 1); an interior chamber (see figure 1) disposed within the envelope; and at least one electrode lead (electrodes 40 & 50) partially housed by the interior chamber having: a single continuous elongated mandrel (Mo coil, 41a & 51a); an electrode tip coil (tip 4b & 5b and winding 4c & 5c) operatively associated with one end of the mandrel; and an overwind component (Mo coil 41a & 51a) operatively associated with the mandrel at a predetermined position as recited in claim 9.

Wherein the electrode tip coil is formed from tungsten (W, see column 4, lines10-12) as recited in claim 10.

Wherein the overwind component is formed from molybdenum (Mo coil 41a & 51a) as recited in claim 11.

Wherein the outside diameter of the overwind component is greater than the outside diameter of the electrode tip coil (see figure 2) as recited in claim 13.

The method claims of 14, 16 & 18 are rejected with respect to Stoffels in view of the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11 since the method of claims 14-18 inherently follow the structure of claims 1-3 and 8-11.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, 12 & 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoffels as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above in view of Yamazaki et al. (U.S. 3,832,590).

Stoffels discloses a ceramic metal halide lamp wherein the mandrel is formed from a single piece of molybdenum wire (column 3, lines 30-37), and fails to disclose a ceramic metal halide lamp wherein the mandrel is formed from a single piece of tungsten wire as recited in claims 7 and 12. Yet Yamazaki discloses a mandrel (lead in wires or rods 5 & 6, figure 2) made from tungsten or molybdenum. Hence it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to substitute the tungsten material selection of

Art Unit: 2879

Yamazaki with the molybdenum of Stoffels to form the mandrel from a single piece of tungsten wire as described in claims 7 and 12.

The method claim 17 is rejected with respect to Stoffels in view of Yamazaki in view of claims 1-6 and 8-11 since the method of claims 14 inherently follow the structure of claims 7 and 12.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest a method for improving the strength and stability of electrode lead wires in ceramic metal halide lamps comprising the steps of mounting a single continuous elongated mandrel within an inner chamber of a lamp envelope; attaching an electrode tip coil to an end of the mandrel; and interconnecting an overwind component with the mandrel at a predetermined position wherein the step of attaching an electrode tip coil to an end of the mandrel includes winding a coil around the end of the mandrel along as recited in claim 15.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Gerike whose telephone number is (703) 308-8991. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

Art Unit: 2879

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3594 for regular communications and (703) 305-3594 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0596.



Matthew J. Gerike  
Patent Examiner  
June 26, 2001



MICHAEL H. DAY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER